Error distributions on large entangled states with non-Markovian dynamics

Dara P. S. McCutcheon,[1,2] Netanel H. Lindner,[3] and Terry Rudolph[1]

[1]*Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK*
[2]*Departamento de Física, FCEyN, UBA and IFIBA, Conicet, Pabellón 1, Ciudad Universitaria, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*
[3]*Department of Physics,Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel*

(Dated: March 21, 2014)

We investigate the distribution of errors on a highly entangled state generated via the repeated emission from an emitter undergoing strongly non-Markovian evolution. For emitter-environment coupling of pure-dephasing form, we show that the probability that a particular patten of errors occurs has a bound of Markovian form, and thus accuracy threshold theorems based on Markovian models should be just as effective. This is the case, for example, for a charged quantum dot emitter in a moderate to strong magnetic field. Beyond the pure-dephasing assumption, though complicated error structures can arise, they can still be qualitatively bounded by a Markovian error model.

arXiv:1403.4956v1 [quant-ph] 19 Mar 2014

The theoretical and technical challenges faced in the construction of a quantum computer have rightly brought into light the question of the scalability of such a device [1–5]. There is, however, significant cause for optimism. In particular, various accuracy threshold theorems imply that quantum computation should be achievable to arbitrary precision [6–12]. The existence of such thresholds relies on quantum error correction codes [13–15], and that the noise afflicting the computation device satisfies certain conditions on its strength, and level of spatial and temporal correlations. In particular, the first theoretical achievements assumed Markovian and independent noise afflicting the components of the quantum computer [6–8], the intuition being that, typically, the components of the device reside in different locations, and that the (local) environments causing the errors are large enough that they have an effectively negligible memory time [16].

While these assumptions will certainly be valid in some quantum systems, whether they are valid for those systems having the necessary characteristics to perform quantum computations remains to be seen. Recently, prompted by a debate between Kalai and Harrow, considerable discussion has taken place in the community about some of the core assumptions of the error models underpinning threshold theorems for fault tolerant quantum computing [5, 12, 17, 18]. Broadly speaking, questions have been raised about the spatial and temporal structure of errors incurred when one creates large entangled states without the usual assumptions of Markovian dynamics. The concern is that any realistic procedure capable of producing such states will necessarily produce errors which cannot be described by the Markovian error models upon which error threshold theorems rely.

The purpose of this work is twofold: In the first instance, we analyse a worst case scenario, wherein a large photonic cluster state [19, 20] is created by a single emitter that is continuously coupled to an environment in a highly non-Markovian manner. In this scenario, it is reasonable to believe that all the errors on this photonic state arise from the emission process, as once the photons are travelling in free space they are effectively decoherence-free. Secondly, we analyse this procedure in the context for a specific experimental proposal with realistic parameters, where the emitter in question is a charged quantum dot interacting with a nuclear spin bath. As our main result, we show that when the emitter is subject to pure-dephasing noise - as can be the case for the proposal we consider - one can obtain a bound on the non-Markovian error distribution probabilities which has a Markovian form. Crucially, this means that methods for combating Markovian errors will work just as efficiently in this highly non-Markovian situation. Our work therefore constitutes a concrete physical example for which the generation of highly entangled states ought to be possible when non-Markovian effects of the emitter are fully taken into account.

In order to give a context and motivation to the following analysis, we phrase our augments in terms of the linear cluster proposal of Ref. [21], which consists of the repeated absorption and reemission of a string of photons from a quantum dot (QD) residing in a magnetic field directed perpendicularly to the QD growth direction [29]. We note that there are practical proposals (with experiments underway) to build such devices [21–24], though we emphasise that our analysis equally applies to any cluster state produced in a similar manner. In the ideal case (no coupling to an environment), a state of n entangled photons and the QD, $|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$, is generated from a initially separable state with the construction [see Fig. (1)]:

$$|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle = \left[\prod_{i=1}^{n}(C_i U_y)\right]|0\rangle_D\,|0\ldots0\rangle \qquad (1)$$

where $|0\rangle_D \equiv |\uparrow\rangle$ ($|1\rangle_D \equiv |\downarrow\rangle$) is the state of the QD aligned (anti-aligned) along the z-axis, $|0\ldots0\rangle \equiv \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n}|R\rangle$ represents the initial state of the n-photons all having right circular polarisation, $C_i = |0\rangle\langle 0|_D \otimes \mathbb{1}_i + |1\rangle\langle 1|_D \otimes X_i$ is a CNOT gate on the QD and the ith photon representing an absorption and emission process, and $U_y = \mathrm{e}^{-iY_D\pi/4}$ rotates the QD about the y-axis. Our basis is such that $Z_D = |0\rangle\langle 0|_D - |1\rangle\langle 1|_D$ and $Z_i = |0\rangle\langle 0|_i - |1\rangle\langle 1|_i$ where $|1\rangle_i \equiv |L\rangle_i$. Non-



FIG. 1: Quantum circuit for the generation of a linear cluster state of five photons and a quantum dot. Non-Markovian decoherence of the dot is modelled as a sequential coupling to an environment. In the ideal case the unitaries are replaced by $\mathrm{e}^{-iY_D\pi/4}\otimes\mathbb{1}_E$.

Markovian evolution of the QD is introduced by sequentially coupling it to an environment such that $U_y \to U$ in Eq. (1), with U acting on the QD and its environment.

Before we do so, we first simply consider the effect of Pauli errors on the QD before, say, the emission of photon l, i.e. we insert X_D, Y_D, or Z_D immediately to the left of C_{l-1} in Eq. (1). We refer to this type of error (on the QD itself as apposed to the resulting photon state) as a *fundamental* error. We find that $|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$ becomes $Z_l|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$, $Z_lZ_{l-1}|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$, and $Z_{l-1}|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$, for X_D, Y_D, and Z_D respectively. Thus, we see that imperfections in the evolution of the QD (fundamental errors), are mathematically equivalent to *localised* errors on the resulting photon state [21].

Knowing how fundamental errors in the QD evolution affect the photonic state, we now investigate how the errors are distributed. We assume that the absorption and emission processes of the photons occur on a timescale far shorter than the rotations of the QD, and the CNOT gates are therefore treated as being instantaneous. It was shown in Ref. [21] that relaxation of this assumption gives rise to photons with wave-packets which correspond to a fixed probability of a fundamental Y error on the QD for each CNOT gate. To model the non-Markovian evolution of the QD between the absorption and reemission process, we replace the ideal rotation about the y-axis in Eq. (1) with the completely general operator $U = |0\rangle\langle 0|_D A_{00} + |0\rangle\langle 1|_D A_{01} + |1\rangle\langle 0|_D A_{10} + |1\rangle\langle 1|_D A_{11}$, where the operators A_{00} etc. act on some state of the environment $|E\rangle$. In the now non-ideal case, Eq. (1) becomes $|\Psi_n\rangle = [\prod_{i=1}^n (C_iU)]\,|0\rangle_D\,|0\ldots0\rangle\,|E\rangle$, which inspection reveals can be written

$$|\Psi_n\rangle = \sum_{\boldsymbol{b}} |b_n\rangle_D\,|\boldsymbol{b}\rangle\,\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{b})\,|E\rangle \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_nb_{n-1}\ldots b_2b_1)$ with $b_i \in \{0,1\}$ a bit string, $\mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{b}) = A_{b_nb_{n-1}}A_{b_{n-1}b_{n-2}}\ldots A_{b_2b_1}A_{b_10}$ is a product of environment operators, and the sum runs over all 2^n possible bit-strings $\boldsymbol{b}$. Eq. (2) is the complete state of the QD, photons and environment after n cycles. Now, we denote by $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_n\alpha_{n-1}\ldots\alpha_2\alpha_1)$ with $\alpha_i \in \{0,1\}$, the probability that the photonic state is measured having Pauli Z errors on those photons for which $\alpha_i = 1$, i.e. the state $|\Phi(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\rangle = [\prod_{i=1}^n Z_i^{\alpha_i}]\,|\mathcal{C}_n\rangle$ [30]. We find $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \langle\Phi(\boldsymbol{\alpha})|\,\mathrm{Tr}_E(|\Psi_n\rangle\langle\Psi_n|)\,|\Phi(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}_E(O(\boldsymbol{\alpha})^\dagger O(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\,|E\rangle\langle E|)$, where the environment operator $O(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sqrt{2}\,\langle+|_D\,W(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\,|0\rangle_D$ is a matrix element of the QD-environment operator

$$W(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{i=1}^n (Z^{\alpha_i}\Delta) = (Z^{\alpha_n}\Delta)\ldots(Z^{\alpha_1}\Delta), \tag{3}$$

with $|+\rangle_D = (1/\sqrt{2})(|0\rangle_D + |1\rangle_D)$, $Z = Z_D\otimes\mathbb{1}_E$, and $\Delta = (1/\sqrt{2})(U - 2\,|0\rangle\langle 0|_D\,U\,|1\rangle\langle 1|_D)$ is a non-unitary operator acting in the joint QD-environment Hilbert space. For the probability of zero errors, for example, we have the scalar $P(\mathbf{0}) = \mathrm{Tr}_E(O(\mathbf{0})^\dagger O(\mathbf{0})\,|E\rangle\langle E|)$, which depends on the environment operator $O(\mathbf{0}) = \sqrt{2}\,\langle+|_D\,W(\mathbf{0})\,|0\rangle_D$, which, from Eq. (3), in turn depends on the QD-environment operator $W(\mathbf{0}) = \Delta^n$. For the probability of an error on, say, photon l, the relevant operator is $W(0\ldots010\ldots0) = \Delta^{n-l}Z\Delta^l$, and so on. Thus, calculating the probability of a given error distribution amounts to calculating products of Z and the non-Hermitian matrix Δ. Eq. (3) provides us with a systematic way to determine error distribution probabilities in the non-Markovian case, making no assumptions about the state of the environment, its memory timescale, or its interaction strength with, or potential correlations with, the QD at any point in the evolution. We point out that although we have phrased our analysis in terms of quantum dots and photons, Eq. (3) is valid for any cluster state generated as shown in Fig. (1).

We now use Eq. (3) to investigate the non-Markovian error distribution probabilities for pure-dephasing evolution of the emitter, which we motivate with the following observations. For electrons in QDs, the dominant source of dephasing is due to coupling to nuclear spins in via hyper-fine interactions [25–27]. Since we consider a field in the y-direction, the Hamiltonian for such an interaction takes the form $H_Y + H_{\mathrm{hf}} + H_{\mathrm{dip}}$, where $H_Y = (\Omega/2)Y_D + (1/2)\sum_k \omega_k I_k^y$ with I_k^y the Pauli y operator on environment spin k, $H_{\mathrm{dip}} = (1/4)\sum_{k,k'} b_{kk'}(I_k^+I_{k'}^- - 2I_k^yI_{k'}^y)$ with $I_k^\pm = (1/2)(I_k^x \pm iI_k^z)$, while the hyper-fine interaction is $H_{\mathrm{hf}} = (1/4)\sum_k A_k\boldsymbol{S}\cdot\boldsymbol{I}_k$. Typically, the Zeeman energy of the QD spin is far larger than those of the nuclei, leading to a suppression of relaxation processes and resulting in decoherence of a pure-dephasing type. The quantity regulating this distinction is $\delta = \mathcal{A}/(\Omega\sqrt{N})$, where $\mathcal{A} = \sum_k A_k$ and N is the number of nuclei appreciably interacting with the QD spin. For $\delta \ll 1$, it was shown that the full Hamiltonian above can be approximated by the pure-dephasing Hamiltonian $H_{\mathrm{PD}} = |+i\rangle\langle+i|\,H_+ + |-i\rangle\langle-i|\,H_-$ where $Y_D\,|\pm i\rangle = \pm\,|\pm i\rangle$ and $H_\pm = \pm\frac{\Omega'}{2}\mathbb{1}_E + \frac{1}{2}\sum_k(\omega_k' \pm$

$\frac{1}{2}A_k)I_k^y \pm \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k\neq k'}\frac{A_kA_{k'}}{\Omega}I_k^+I_{k'}^- + H_{\rm dip}$, with Ω' and ω_k' renormalised Zeeman energies which we can absorb into their definitions. For typical GaAs QDs the total coupling strength $\mathcal{A}\sim 1$ T, while the typical values of N range from 10^4 to 10^6 [25, 26]. Thus, field strengths of $\Omega\sim 100$ mT and above should be well described by the pure-dephasing Hamiltonian.

We now use $H_{\rm PD}$ given above in $U = \exp[-i\pi/(2\Omega)H_{\rm PD}]$, and from Eq. (3) we then find for a general error distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ we have

$$O(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\sqrt{(-1)^{f_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}}}{2}\left(U_- + (-1)^{f_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}U_+\right) \quad (4)$$

where $f_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_{j=i}^{n}\alpha_j$, and $U_\pm = \exp[-i(\pi/4\Omega)H_\pm]$. Thus, the relevant environment operator consists of a product of n operators, each of which being either $M_\pm = (\sqrt{\pm 1}/2)(U_- \pm U_+)$ depending on the error distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Using Eq. (4), and the sub-multiplacative property of the operator norm defined as $||A|| \equiv \max_{|\phi\rangle}\langle\phi|A|\phi\rangle/\langle\phi|\phi\rangle$, we find the non-Markovian error probabilities satisfy

$$P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \leq ||M_-^\dagger M_-||^{h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}||M_+^\dagger M_+||^{n-h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \quad (5)$$

where $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \frac{1}{2}(n - \sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{f_i(\boldsymbol{\alpha})})$ is the number of occurrences of M_- in Eq. (4). We see that $||M_-^\dagger M_-||$ plays the role of an error probability, with unitarity of $U_\pm$ ensuring that $||M_\pm^\dagger M_\pm|| \leq 1$. We note that $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ does not count the number of single errors on the photonic state; it counts the number of *adjacent pairs* necessary to create it, or equivalently, the number of fundamental errors which occurred in the QD evolution. This is a property of the pure-dephasing Hamiltonian, whose form $H_{\rm PD} = |+i\rangle\langle+i|H_+ + |-i\rangle\langle-i|H_-$ means that the environment can only induce fundamental Y errors on the QD, which amount to adjacent pairs of errors on the resulting photonic cluster state. A single isolated error, say $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (010)$, requires multiple adjacent pairs that cancel out in such a way as to make it; i.e we have $h(010) = 2$, since pairs of adjacent errors at positions 1 and 2 are required to realise this distribution.

Eq. (5) shows that even in the non-Markovian case, we can put a rigorous bound on the probability of a given error distribution, which behaves as a power law in the number of fundamental errors in the distribution. More importantly for our purposes here, we see that the non-Markovian nature of the environment cannot introduce long range spatial correlations in the errors; the probability of h fundamental errors is bounded by p_-^h with $p_- = ||M_-^\dagger M_-|| \leq 1$. These results are valid for any cluster state generated in the way shown in Fig. (1) when the emitter-environment coupling takes on a pure-dephasing form.

To investigate the behaviour of this bound, we now refer to the specific case of the QD pure-dephasing Hamiltonian. To proceed, we notice that the total spin projection in the y-direction is conserved, $[H_\pm, \sum_k I_k^y] = 0$. The operators $H_\pm$ are therefore block-diagonal, as too is $U_\pm = \exp[-i(\pi/4\Omega)H_\pm]$ from which the probabilities are calculated. The result is that the error distribution probabilities become a sum over contributions from spaces with fixed spin projections. Formally, by defining projection operators $\mathcal{P}_m$ which satisfy $\sum_m \mathcal{P}_m = \mathbb{1}_E$ and project onto the eigenspace with eigenvalue of $\sum_k I_k^y$ equal to m, the probabilities can be written $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \sum_m P_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ where $P_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = {\rm Tr}_E(O_m^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\alpha})O_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\rho_m)$, and ρ_m is the environment state in the m subspace, while $O(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \mathcal{P}_m O(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\mathcal{P}_m$. Written in this way, we can make use of properties we know of the environment state. For example, while the specific state of the environment may be unknown, it may be reasonable to assume that only states within a particular range of m are present. In such a case the sum over m above will contain less terms. For example, for an initial environment state having weight in a single m sector only, we can write $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = P_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and bound by

$$P_m(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \leq ||M_-^{(m)\dagger}M_-^{(m)}||^{h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})}||M_+^{(m)\dagger}M_+^{(m)}||^{n-h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \quad (6)$$

where $M_\pm^{(m)} = \mathcal{P}_m M_\pm \mathcal{P}_m$. This bound is tighter than that given in Eq. (5) since the operators involved necessarily act non-trivially in a smaller space.

In Fig. (2) we plot the exact non-Markovian error probabilities (blue circles) and the bound calculated using Eq. (6) (red crosses), using the pure-dephasing Hamiltonian. The left panels show all 2^5 error distribution probabilities for a 5-photon state, ordered by increasing fundamental (double) errors, for an environment of $N = 10$ spins initially in an equal mixture



FIG. 2: Left panels: all 2^5 non-Markovian error distribution probabilities for a 5-photon state, calculated exactly (blue circles), using the bound given in Eq. (6) (red crosses), and a best-fit to a Markovian model of the form $p^h(1-p)^{n-h}$ (green circles). The error distributions are ordered along the x-axis such that those corresponding to the least number of fundamental errors are to the left. The inset in the lower plot shows a zoom in of the $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 2$ band. Right panels: scaling of a typical error distribution probability with increasing environment size.

in the $m = 0$ subspace [31]. We see the probabilities fall into distinct bands depending on their value of $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, and that the bounds correctly capture the behaviour of the exact values. For small $\mathcal{A}/\Omega$ our derived bound is relatively tight, while for $\mathcal{A}/\Omega = 2$ where our derived bound gives fairly high values, the exact probabilities are still well behaved and remain low. In fact, they can be bounded using a simple best-fit procedure by a Markovian model of the form $p^h(1-p)^{n-h}$, with p significantly less than p_-, as show in green on the lower left plot. Therefore, it is clear from Fig. (2), that the non-Markovian errors do not show harmful long-range correlations, as the bound suggests. Thus, strategies to combat errors assuming Markovian evolution of the QD, should, in this regime, work just as well in the non-Markovian case.

We also note that the exact non-Markovian probabilities in the same band are *approximately* equal. This is a result of the initially mixed environment state we consider, whose Overhauser field $(\sum_k A_k I_k^y)$ changes little over the course of evolution, and indeed does so in a chaotic way owing to the inequality of the coupling constants. The differences (seen in the inset) are due to small fluctuations in the Overhauser field, making errors slightly more likely at certain positions in the photonic state.

In order to affirm the utility of the bounds on the error distribution, in the right panels of Fig. (2) we show the scaling with increasing environment size of both the exact probability and the bound in Eq. (6), for a typical error distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (01100)$ for which $h(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = 1$. For pure-dephasing dynamics, the exact probabilities ought to scale as $\sim 1-(1+|a|\,N^{-2})^{-1/2}$ where a is fixed for fixed $\mathcal{A}$ and Ω [25, 26], and we find that the bound obeys a similar scaling $\sim c-(1-|a|\,N^{-2})^{-1/2}$. The dashed lines show fits of this form, showing that the probabilities and bound scale as expected with N. Thus, the bound we derive tends to a constant value with increasing environment size, and for small $\mathcal{A}/\Omega$, can directly replace the error rate in threshold theorems assuming *Markovian* error models. In fact, even when $\mathcal{A}/\Omega$ takes on higher values, our numerics strongly suggest that one can *tightly* bound the error distribution with a Markovian model.

For typical QDs the pure-dephasing form is valid for magnetic field strengths of ~ 100 mT and above. However, for optimal performance of the specific cluster state proposal we consider [21] smaller magnetic fields would be preferred (though not essential). To briefly investigate this regime, in the top panel of Fig. (3) we show the non-Markovian error distribution probabilities calculated using the full hyper-fine Hamiltonian, for an 8 photon state with $\mathcal{A}/\Omega = 2$ and $N = 6$ such that $\delta \approx 0.8$ (so that $\Omega \sim 1$ mT for realistic QD sizes). We see that the band structure becomes convoluted with distributions whose probabilities lie above their bands. These distributions all have the form $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 = (0\ldots1\ldots0)$; the Hamiltonian we now use can induce fundamental X and Z errors on the QD, which correspond to *single* errors on the photon state. This can be further understood in the middle panel, where we show the corresponding polarisation of the environment $\langle\sum_k I_k^y\rangle$ for each distribution; when a distribution of the form $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$ is realised, angular momentum is exchanged with the environment.



FIG. 3: Top: all 2^8 exact non-Markovian error probabilities for a 8 photon state in the non-pure-dephasing case. Middle: corresponding polarisation $\langle\sum_k I_k^y\rangle$ of the spin environment: error probabilities falling outside their bands correspond to angular momentum exchanges. Bottom: the qualitative features of the probability distribution can be captured by a simple Markovian model shown in green.

Though these exact non-Markovian probabilities appear to have a more complicated structure, they can still be qualitatively described by a Markovian model. With any error distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ we can associate a finite number of QD trajectories which will result in it. An error distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1$, for example, can be made from a combination of fundamental Y errors, or a single X or Z error. We can therefore define a simple Markovian model, wherein we assign fixed probabilities for fundamental X, Y, and Z errors, from these calculate the probability of a given trajectory, and sum over all trajectories corresponding to a given error distribution. Probabilities calculated in this way are shown in green in the lower panel of Fig. (3). Importantly, we see that these Markovian error probabilities qualitatively capture all the exact non-Markovian probabilities.

To conclude, we have investigated the distribution of errors on a large entangled state generated by the continual emission from a single emitter undergoing non-Markovian evolution. For pure-dephasing dynamics, we found that the error probabilities have a bound of Markovian form, meaning that error correction schemes remain just as effective in this non-Markovian regime. We have shown that the structure of errors can be bounded by a Markovian model even beyond pure-dephasing dynamics, suggesting the board applicability of our findings.

Acknowledgments - D.P.S.M. thanks CONICET for support, T.R. thanks Toshiba Research Europe Ltd, and N.L. thanks the Bi-National Science Foundation and I-Core: the Israel Excellence Center "Circle of Light". D.P.S.M. and T.R. also acknowledge support from the EPSRC and CHIST-ERA project SSQN.

[1] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 992 (1995).
[2] R. Alicki et al., Phys. Rev. A **65**, 062101 (2002).
[3] R. Alicki, D. A. Lidar, and P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 052311 (2006).
[4] R. Alicki, arXiv:quant-ph/0411008 (2004).
[5] G. Kalai, arXiv:quant-ph/1106.0485 (2011), arXiv:quant-ph/0904.3265 (2009), arXiv:quant-ph/0806.2443 (2008), arXiv:quant-ph/0607021 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0508095 (2005).
[6] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or, Proc. 29th Ann. ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing p. 179 (1998).
[7] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A **454**, 365 (1998).
[8] J. Preskill, Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A **454**, 385 (1998).
[9] P. Aliferis, D. Gottesman, and J. Preskill (2005), quant-ph/0504218.
[10] B. M. Terhal and G. Burkard, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 012336 (2005).
[11] D. Aharonov, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050504 (2006).
[12] J. Preskill, Quant. Inf. Comput. **13**, 181 (2013).
[13] P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 2493 (1995).
[14] A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1995).
[15] R. Laflamme et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 198 (1996).
[16] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
[17] R. Galai and A. Harrow (2012), URL `http://rjlipton.wordpress.com/2012/01/30/`.
[18] S. T. Flammia and A. W. Harrow, Q. Inf. & Comp. **13**, 1 (2013).
[19] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
[20] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003).
[21] N. H. Lindner and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 113602 (2009).
[22] Y. Li, L. Aolita, and L. C. Kwek, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 032313 (2011).
[23] S. E. Economou, N. Lindner, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 093601 (2010).
[24] Q. Lin and B. He, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 022331 (2010).
[25] Ł. Cywiński, W. M. Witzel, and S. D. Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 245314 (2009).
[26] Ł. Cywiński, W. M. Witzel, and S. D. Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett **102**, 057601 (2009).
[27] E. Barnes, Ł. Cywiński, and S. D. Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 140403 (2012).
[28] D. E. Browne and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010501 (2005).
[29] While linear cluster states are not sufficient for universal quantum computation, using linear optics alone they may be fused into higher dimension structures [28], and it seems implausible that a complicated error structure could accumulate owing to the fusion process.
[30] Generally the photonic state will contain coherences of different $|\Phi(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\rangle$ states, though these can be suppressed by applying random Pauli Z_i operators.
[31] The coupling coefficients follow a Gaussian distribution, $A_k \propto \exp[-(2k/N)^2]$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{N} A_k = \mathcal{A}$ independent of N. Similarly $b_{kk'} \propto \exp[-(2k/N)^2 - (2k'/N)^2]$ such that $\sum_{k'=1}^{N} b_{kk'}/A_k = 100$, while $\sum_k \omega_k/\Omega = 100$.